



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/505,594	02/16/2000	Jay Paul Drummond	D-1120-R1	5969

28995 7590 06/08/2005

RALPH E. JOCKE
walker & jocke LPA
231 SOUTH BROADWAY
MEDINA, OH 44256

EXAMINER

SUBRAMANIAN, NARAYANSWAMY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3624

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

JUN 08 2005

GROUP 3600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/505,594
Filing Date: February 16, 2000
Appellant(s): DRUMMOND ET AL.

Ralph E. Jocke (Reg. No. 31,029)
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed December 23, 2004.

S.O.O.

Art Unit: 3624

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct. However in a conversation between SPE Vincent Millin and Mr. Ralph Jocke (Appellant's attorney) it was explained to Attorney Jocke that the reason for non-response was the application was lost in transition.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

The rejection of claims 1-11, 45 and 46 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

Art Unit: 3624

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

6311165

Coutts et al

10-2001

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-11, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coutts et al (US Patent 6,311,165 B1) as discussed in paragraph 4 of the final office action mailed on August 10, 2004. This rejection has been appended below for the convenience of the reader.

With reference to claim 1, Coutts teaches an automated transaction machine comprising: a plurality of transaction function devices, wherein each transaction function device includes an associated device computer processor, wherein at least one device computer processor associated with a first transaction function device is operative responsive to being placed in operative connection with at least one other device computer processor associated with a second transaction function device, to cause the first transaction function device to become automatically interoperative with the second transaction function device; a data store in operative connection with both the first transaction function device and the second transaction function device, wherein the first transaction function device is operative to access a device driver from the data store, wherein the device computer processor associated with the first transaction function device is operative responsive to the device driver to interact with the second transaction function device in carrying out a financial transaction with the automated transaction

Art Unit: 3624

machine (See Coutts Figures 4, 8, 11, 15, Abstract, Column 3 line 10 – Column 4 line 54, Column 9 line 10 – Col 10 line 55 and Claims 1-5). The server includes a data store.

Coutts does not explicitly teach the step wherein a transaction function device is operative to communicate a device driver from the transaction function device to the data store for storage in the data store.

Official notice is taken that the step wherein a transaction function device is operative to communicate a device driver from the transaction function device to the data store for storage in the data store is old and well known in the art. Communication of a device driver from the device to a data store helps in synchronization of transaction events making the process more efficient.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this step to the disclosure of Coutts. The combination of the teachings taken as a whole suggests that the users of the device would have benefited from increased efficiency in processing the transaction.

With reference to claim 2, Coutts teaches a automated transaction machine according to claim 1, and further comprising a network, wherein the network is in operative connection with the at least one data store, the first transaction function device and the second transaction function device, wherein the device computer processor associated with the first transaction function device is operative responsive to the device driver to communicate with the second transaction device through the network (See Coutts Column 3 line 55 – Column 4 line 8, Column 9 lines 34 – 40, Column 9 line 55 – Column 10 line 4).

With reference to claim 3, Coutts teaches a automated transaction machine according to claim 2, wherein the driver is a hardware independent software component that is operative in

Art Unit: 3624

the device computer processor associated with the first transaction function device (See Coutts Column 25 lines 32-35 and Claim 34).

With reference to claim 4, Coutts teaches an automated transaction machine comprising: a plurality of transaction function devices, wherein each transaction function device includes an associated device computer processor, wherein at least one device computer processor associated with a first transaction function device is operative responsive to being placed in operative connection with at least one other device computer processor associated with a second transaction function device to cause the first transaction function device to become automatically interoperative with the second transaction function device, wherein the first transaction function device interacts with the second transaction function device in carrying out a financial transaction with the automated transaction machine; a network, wherein the network is in operative connection with at least one data store, wherein the data store includes a transaction function device driver, wherein the device computer processor associated with the second transaction function device is operative to cause the driver to be stored in the data store, wherein the second transaction function device is operative responsive to the driver, wherein the first transaction function device interacts with the second transaction function device responsive to operation of the driver (See discussion of Claim 1 above and Column 21 lines 4-36).

With reference to claims 5-9, Coutts teaches an automated transaction machine wherein the device computer processor associated with the first transaction function device is operative to acquire the driver from the data store; wherein the device computer processor associated with the first transaction function device includes a virtual machine, wherein the driver is operative in the virtual machine; wherein the driver includes a method that is operative to cause the second

Art Unit: 3624

transaction function device to perform a portion of the transaction, wherein the device computer processor associated with the first transaction function device is operative to invoke the method; wherein the device computer processor associated with the second transaction function device is operative to cause the first transaction function device to perform a portion of the transaction responsive to a remote procedure call by the driver and wherein the second transaction function device includes a sheet dispenser, and wherein the transaction includes the dispense of a sheet from the sheet dispenser. (See Coutts Abstract, Column 3 line 10 – Column 4 line 54, Column 9 lines 53-67, Column 11 line 53 – Column 14 line 11, Column 25 lines 25-29 and Claims 1-5 and 34-35).

With reference to claims 10 and 11, Coutts teaches an automated financial transaction machine comprising a plurality of transaction function devices, wherein at least one of the transaction function devices includes a sheet dispenser, and wherein each one of the transaction function devices includes an associated device computer, and wherein at least one of the device computers is programmed so that operative connection of a first transaction function device to the machine automatically causes the first transaction function device to coordinate operation with at least one other transaction function device in carrying out a financial transaction which includes the dispense of at least one sheet from the sheet dispenser, wherein the first transaction function device is operative to communicate a device driver from the first transaction function device to the at least one other transaction function device, wherein the at least one of the device computers of the at least one other transaction function device is operative responsive to the device driver communicated from the first transaction function device to communicate with the first transaction function device, and further comprising a database in operative connection with

Art Unit: 3624

each of the transaction function devices, wherein each of the plurality of transaction function devices includes an associated device driver stored therein and is operative to communicate the associated device driver to the data store for storage therein, wherein the at least one other transaction function device is operative to access the device driver associated with the first transaction function device from the data store (See discussion of claim 1 above and Column 25 lines 25-36).

With reference to claims 45 and 46, Coutts teaches the step wherein the sheet dispenser comprises a cash dispenser (See Column 25 lines 25-30).

(11) *Response to Argument*

In response to Appellant's arguments about claims 1-3, 6-9 and 46, that Coutts does not teach the steps of "the first transaction function device is operative to access the device driver from the data store; and the device computer processor associated with the first transaction function device is operative responsive to the device driver, to interact with the second transaction function device in carrying out a financial transaction with the automated transaction machine" the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Coutts Figures 4a and 4b, shows a central processor in connection with the peripheral devices. The central processor includes a data store for storing device driver (See Coutts Column 3 lines 55-65). The transaction function device is operative to access the device driver from the data store (See Coutts Column 3 lines 55-65). Coutts also discloses the step wherein the device computer processor associated with the first transaction function device is operative responsive to a device driver, to interact with the second transaction function device in carrying out a financial transaction with the automated transaction machine (See Coutts Abstract). Coutts does not explicitly teach the step wherein a second

Art Unit: 3624

transaction function device is operative to communicate a device driver from the second transaction function device to the data store for storage in the data store. Official notice was taken to provide this missing step. In support of the official notice taken, the examiner would like to direct the Appellant's attention to the David Clarke reference listed in the IDS. David Clarke discloses JINI technology (Clarke Pages 16-17) wherein intelligent peripherals using Java virtual machine (JVM) communicate Java objects and codes with other peripherals through the RMI interface and layer. More details for this technology can be found in (Jini Device Architecture Specification Reference, January 25, 1999 pages 6-8). The motivation to combine these steps is that each of the operating modules (peripheral devices) can be conveniently and independently updated using JAVA executable program code. This motivation can be found in Coutts Column 3 lines 18-26.

In response to Appellant's arguments about claims 4 and 5, that Coutts does not teach the step of "the device computer processor associated with the second transaction function device is operative to cause the driver to be stored in the data store; and the first transaction function device interacts with the second transaction function device responsive to operation of the driver" the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Coutts Figures 4a and 4b, shows a central processor in connection with the peripheral devices. The central processor includes a data store for storing device driver (See Coutts Column 3 lines 55-65). The transaction function devices are operative to access the device driver from the data store (See Coutts Column 3 lines 55-65) and the first transaction function device interacts with the second transaction function device responsive to operation of the driver (See Coutts Abstract). The Coutts abstract very clearly discloses that the peripheral devices communicate with each other and that a peripheral operates in response to

Art Unit: 3624

signal generated by another peripheral. Coutts does not explicitly teach the step wherein a second transaction function device is operative to communicate a device driver from the second transaction function device to the data store for storage in the data store. Official notice was taken to provide this missing step. In support of the official notice taken, the examiner would like to direct the Appellant's attention to the David Clarke reference listed in the IDS. David Clarke discloses JINI technology (Clarke Pages 16-17) wherein intelligent peripherals using Java virtual machine (JVM) communicate Java objects and codes with other peripherals through the RMI interface and layer. More details for this technology can be found in (Jini Device Architecture Specification Reference, January 25, 1999 pages 6-8). The motivation to combine these steps is that each of the operating modules (peripheral devices) can be conveniently and independently updated using JAVA executable program code. This motivation can be found in Coutts Column 3 lines 18-26.

In response to Appellant's arguments about claims 10, 11 and 45, that Coutts does not teach the steps of "the first transaction function device is operative to communicate a device driver from the first transaction function device to the at least one other transaction function device; and the at least one of the device computers of the at least one other transaction function device, is operative responsive to the device driver communicated from the first transaction function device, to communicate with the first transaction function device" the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Coutts Figures 4a and 4b, shows a central processor in connection with the peripheral devices. Coutts abstract also clearly discloses the steps wherein the first transaction function device is operative to communicate a device driver from the first transaction function device to the at least one other transaction function device; and the at least one of the

Art Unit: 3624

device computers of the at least one other transaction function device, is operative responsive to the device driver communicated from the first transaction function device, to communicate with the first transaction function device.

Hence the cited reference in combination with the provided support for the official notice taken discloses all the features and relationships that are claimed. For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Narayanswamy Subramanian
Examiner
Art Unit 3624

March 17, 2005

Conferees

Vincent Millin,
SPE, Art Unit 3624


Joseph Thomas
SPE, Art Unit 3626



VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600